



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,181	05/23/2001	William A. Cox	CWL-101-A	9646

7590 11/15/2002

Andrew R. Baslie
Young & Baslie, P.C.
Suite 624
3001 West Big Beaver Road
Troy, MI 48084

EXAMINER

PETERSON, KENNETH E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/863,181

Applicant(s)

COX, WILLIAM A.

Examiner

Kenneth E Peterson

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Applicant's election with traverse of group I in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that the method could not be used with a different apparatus.

This is not found persuasive because method could be employed without the removable supports. For example, the method could be employed with an apparatus that had non-removable supports, which is common in the prior art. A further example is that the method could be employed without a cover, namely with an apparatus with columns that join directly together sans cover.

Altho only one-way distinctness is required in this situation, examiner will further show two-way distinctness, in that the apparatus could be employed in a different method. For example, the apparatus could be employed to process a workpiece without removing the die. A further example is the apparatus, as broadly claimed, could have the die installed or removed in a direction perpendicular to its axis of rotation, as opposed to parallel to its axis of rotation.

Claims 18-35 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected group, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-8,10,11,13-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fawell et al., who shows a die system with all of the recited limitations including a base (bottom of figure 1) and a plurality of columns (best seen in figure 3) that are removable (see bolt heads). Fawell also shows a cross support or cover (best seen in figure 2 as the top cross-support member). Fawell has a first modular die support (27), and a second modular die support (29) both of which are removable as seen by the bolt heads in figure 9. Fawell also has a pair of rotary dies (best seen in figure 6) that have lateral rims that engage the modular die supports to prevent lateral motion. The dies are positionable to contact one another along said rims, and this positioning is accomplished using a pressure member (2). Each modular die support has a cylindrical roller bearing (see the cylindrical bushings supporting the die rollers in figure 6). There are elements considered to be spacers between the die supports, for example, the bottom portion of element 27.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fawell et al. in view of Stollenwerk.

Fawell, as set forth above, shows a die apparatus with all of the recited limitations except the modular die supports do not have peripherally offset rollers to support the rotating die rollers. However, such is well known as shown by Stollenwerk (52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Fawell by employing peripherally offset rollers on the modular die supports, as suggested by Stollenwerk, in order to reduce friction between the modular die support and the die roller.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ken Peterson whose telephone number is 703-308-2186. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday between 7am and 4pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9302. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

kp
November 14, 2002



KENNETH E. PETERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER